

Each individual observes the reality from own perspective. When majority of people agrees upon a same vision it is called the (religious) truth but it has nothing to do with the substance itself. An essence remains unchanged, untouched by different opinions and interpretations.

Every culture, in course of human history, worshipped some sort of deity(ies). As cultures vanished so did their respective belief systems. Whether monotheistic or polytheistic, and regardless of devotees number, religions passed away leaving only traces of their prior influence buried under ground, waiting to be found by archaeologists or accidental discoverers. We are digging remains of temples dating back slightly more than ten thousand years and admire how ancient they are. We are excavating fossils hundreds of thousand, even millions, of years old in order to collect pieces of a puzzle called origins of life. Yet, what are thousands and millions compared to billions. What are billions compared to Eons? Furthermore, what is Multiverse compared to parallel temporal existence?

Humans tend to observe the picture from their narrow perspective. It is like standing on a small rock and trying to see what is on the other side of a mountain. How can anyone understand evolution from such limited point of view? To grasp evolvement of the Universe is much harder. Concept of conformal cyclic cosmology, proposed by Sir Roger Penrose, or any similar idea, with respect to continuity, like perpetual expansion and contraction, dissolution and reemerging, is even harder then trying to explain Universe growth alone. There are clusters of temperature variances recognizable in WMAP image. Are that supermassive black holes from previous span? Just imagine the implication of this revelation. It could mean that Universe is evolving as well. Where are the roots? Who is responsible, God or Nature? To be honest, both seems equally plausible due to our current inability of performing deeper insight, either on quantum or general scale. Technical capabilities are still inadequate and maybe they will be like that forever in

case reality is fractal.

Easiest answer is God - divine mind, ultimate entity above any formulation and categorization, undefinable, spiritual. Next, when asked about Its profile simplest solution is that It is eternal and infinite, not having beginning and end, creating everything but not suffering and all the dangers we are exposed to like destructive cosmic events, multiple, ranging from deadly viruses to getting swallowed by black hole, bursted with jets of particles and cosmic radiation.

After watching many debates between religious side and science promoters, I noticed that one of usual arguments is causality. Perhaps, there is no beginning and end, no cause and effect in spacetime sense - indeed, change could be an only constant. Since causality principle is derived from material world, how can they relate it to the metaphysical aspect? According to their reasoning, Universe couldn't be eternal and infinite so they, neatly, introduce one more instance which supposedly is. Why not proceeding in the same manner ad infinitum, meaning there is another level above and beyond, and another, and another, etc.... Regression is an obstacle. Hence, they terminate sequence immediately after second interval. Believers in God are like someone who has started a course in art, stopped after second try and pronounced themselves masters.

Nowadays science offers an alternative: transformation of unstable vacuum state into physical realm, interchanging back and forth like pendulum, without any need for Creator, per se. There is no Alpha and Omega but

mechanism of perpetual succession.

Do you know the story of Hell's Entrance, Pluto's gate, in Hierapolis? I like it because it shows priesthood malevolence in its worst form: manipulation of naive people as tool for their subordination. Clergymen walked in the cave beneath Pluto's statue taking an animal(s) with themselves. Pluto is ancient Greek, mythological lord of underworld and father of Furies, prior known as Hades, accompanied by Cerberus, and so on, this story alone has thousand different elements, added or subtracted as contemporary religious hierarchy saw fit. Anyway, priests would go into the grotto, prayed to Pluto and returned alive, seemingly well, while on the other hand, poor, sacrificial animals died almost instantaneously. Explained by holy ministry, it was due to God's will or punishment because animals didn't pray to Hades, lacked soul or whatever reason they invented. Science, gratefully, clarified this primitive conundrum. Temple was built upon fissure, belonging to Babadag fracture zone, where emissions of CO₂ resulted in lethal concentrations near ground level, stronger at dawn, possible to avoid by holding breath and moving higher above toxic gas lake.

Fine tuning argument is second most often used proof of God's presence. Already partially discredited with my destructive cosmic events list, DICEs for short, from recently we can add that Universe is receding slightly faster than it was previously calculated, and that expansion is accelerating with distance, meaning that constants values require proportional readjustments, especially beyond boundaries of the known Universe, and that both scientific and theological views will have to modify accordingly. Simply put, fine tuning argument is obsolete.

Loop mind is psychological condition happening when and where religious indoctrination, mostly during sensitive age of childhood, exceeds development of critical, objective, rational and dialectical thought producing undesirable side effects in the form of 1) inability to conduct serious, educated discussion, 2) overemphasized mental dependence and 3) sacred echoes or sounds of angelic voices resonating inside believers heads directing them to commit brutal acts of violence, sacrificial butchery and murder; every misdeed is simply justified as execution of God's will.

Argument "Hitler, Stalin and Mao Zedong were atheists" is sometimes pulled implying that all atheists are evil which is utterly wrong presumption based on faulty premise. Hitler was Nazi, other two were communists and these facts were determining factors solely. Vice versa, it could be said that "Pope Innocent III, Akhenaten and Reverend Jim Jones were believers" implying that all believers were evil. In each of the mentioned cases, personal conviction is irrelevant to empathy deficit, antisocial behaviour and narcissistic traits. Whether atheist or believer, it is just a matter of private opinion. It doesn't involve bit of individual's psychology or lifestyle. I know the case of a believer who committed triple murder after praying in his local (catholic) church. I know believers who are decent folks. Same goes with atheists: some of them are good, some aren't but to make any decision about person only on basis of religious or irreligious attitude is wrong. Why some groups talk with disgust about non-members calling them pagans and infidels? Because of attached mandatoriness and exclusivity principles selfishly raising those who share same interest, idea or belief to higher position, ignoring any rational criteria, making subjective and biased decisions in order to promote each other as better and more worthy than others.

I find repulsive using rhetorics, mythology, lies and poverty as means of

exploiting human weaknesses in order to present own faith or cause as superior.

Contextually, I must here report my unpleasant, disrespectful and financially damaging experiences done by chauvinistic, religious fundamentalists. Due to their connections to the state and Church hierarchy, based on political, kin, ecclesiastical and provincial relations, enabling them to use repressive system, available state logistics and extremists network for own benefit, this report shall serve both as legal basis for my lawsuit against prementioned and asylum seeking in any decent country that welcomes personal intellectual endeavour above primitive grounds for individual determination, professional advancement or obtaining faculty degree.

We should clarify distinction between specific terms. 1) To be "atheist" means not believing in God - opposed to being "theist" which means believing in God. 2) To be "agnostic" means refuting esoteric knowledge about divine - opposed to being "gnostic" which means having esoteric knowledge about divine. 3) To be "religious" means accepting particular belief system - opposed to being "irreligious" which means not accepting any belief system. 4) "Sceptic" is a person who doubts in certain idea or belief. 5) "Believer" is a person who has faith in specific deity or religion. 6) "Naturalist" is a person who views reality solely as a domain of scientific understanding without need for divine implication. 7) "Philosopher" is a person who seeks knowledge, wisdom or enlightenment. Using this interpretations I would describe myself as a philosopher. Regarding atheism and theism I would place myself right in between. Same applies for agnostic/gnostic category. Explanation for both is that I lack sufficient data to claim either. I consider Taoism insightful, Buddhism empathetic and more or less interesting notions could be found in some other religions as well, such as Christianity or Hinduism, which partially makes me religious. On the other hand, I am convinced beyond doubt that neither religion offers complete information, not even close, about reality in

general. Science is needed to provide us with necessary answers related to the Universe origin. Only when this task is fully accomplished we can start formulating correct understanding of the Nature. Hence, I am for the most part naturalist.

Intelligent design argument assumes existence of a single Universe. What if there were countless Universes spontaneously collapsing due to configurational instability? This particular one had appropriate variables to sustain itself and create life. Anyway, it will be science, an experimental method, which will determine validity of these claims, certainly not faith with its fixed point of view dating back to the times when people were tortured and crucified just because they openly expressed their inner ideas.

Talking about deduction, suggestion that things precisely happened in particular order for us to exist is reversed to causality principle meaning one of them strictly of rhetorical worth. Which one I leave to debaters like Hamza Tzortzis and William Lane Craig who both repeatedly use them without comprehension of either.

"God of gaps" is phrase used to counter theological aspirations, denoting areas of inquiry or specific things not (yet) explained by science, made in order to undermine scientific process and exalt religious beliefs. Modern science has begun in 16th-17th century with Nicolaus Copernicus and Isaac Newton. Giving it merely five hundred (500) years till now, compared to Universe age, is it fair to request super fast response, or even an immediate answer, to most profound questions concerning existence of God, Cosmos

origin and nature of reality? I think not. What religion does, in contrast, it provides naive, self-explanatory, encircled apologetics such as "I am who I am" or "God moves in a mysterious way" which sound incredibly smart to illiterate souls who in their turn, out of religious indoctrination, ask what "plausible", "could" and similar terms related to statistical probability, stand for.

Meanwhile, unfortunately, a poor victim has turned into a merciless predator. Those who were once prosecuted by others now prosecute others for their own behalf. Faith must be upheld with exertion, constraint, harassment, intimidation, pressure, threats, excommunication, savagery, violence and it must be already introduced during sensitive childhood age otherwise it snaps, cracks like dry twig under mere appearance of scientific data and common sense.

Nasty, evil things happen inside religious institutions which sign contract with the state. Is there worse pact than one made between wicked communion and lazy bureaucracy? Magdalen laundries and reformatory schools in Ireland are terrible examples of such enterprise: no salary for employees, unhealthy living and working conditions, perpetual mental and physical abuse. In 1993. unmarked graves were found at convent ground in Dublin. After two hundred (200) years of existence and not before public interest was raised, government decided to inspect allegations. In 2013. Inter-Departmental Committee, chaired by Senator Martin McAleese, published its report followed by pro-bono project run by judge John Quirke. Term "legal compensation (for victims)" was replaced with much softer term ex-gratia (as a favour). Out of tens of thousands afflicted (at least ten thousand), through Magdalen institutions operating history, only last survived, eligible women, eight hundred fourteen (814) of them, received payments ranging from €11,500 and €100,000, total of €32.8m until January, 2022. Although presented as large, it is ridiculously small amount in the

world where single! manager bonuses and sport transfer values more. Despite failing to register a death is criminal offence, no official charges were filled against any of the "charity sisters". No wonder that interested religious groups welcomed this report even using it as an evidence to support their own claims and calling it "fully documented lies". Report itself notes that small number of testimonies were taken, sample was not randomly selected and can not be considered representative. Additionally, from 118 (or 128) statements gathered almost half belong to women still directly under religious supervision while 1940`s is an earliest period of inquiry. Collected statements generally negate sexual and physical abuse in laundries, relate it to prior industrial schooling time, but often mention verbal abuse and describe labour as "hardest work ever". Moreover, laundry contracts haven't complied to Fair Wage and social insurance obligations. All communication with an outside world was controlled by nuns. Based on report findings, government representative Enda Kenny gave an official statement which was more than apology. He stripped Ireland of flattering self-portrait, of a good living God-fearing nation, in the same manner as girls admitted in Magdalen laundries were stripped of their real names. What about reformatory education and home system? Well, in Tuam forensic examiners excavated remains of dead babies, 35 weeks to 3 years old, thrown in a sewage tank with no burial records. Luckier ones, not sick or malnourished, were subjected to forced adoption (legalised human trafficking). Initially, local authorities took no action in 1975. when human bones were found and left the scene to private effort. Decades later, again not before public interest was raised, government started an investigation, discovered hundreds of corpses in mass grave and made official apology in 2021. Responsible religious order, Congregation of the Sisters of Bon Secours, said they failed in their Christianity. In 2018. Pope Francis read the apology, not forgetting to protect members of the Church hierarchy, asking for forgiveness. Same as in Magdalen case, official charges were not filled.

"The need of supernatural entity for establishment of moral standard" is an additional argument used for divine authority justification. I found enough information in physiology to establish my code of conduct directed toward another living beings. It is exactly biology from where I derive personal

empathy. The fact that all living and breathing beings share same emotional pattern is overwhelming insight. Animals pet their youngster same as humans their offspring. Animals feel pain and fear just like humans do. Regarding interpersonal relations, fact that all humans have brain and nervous system is determining factor to develop compassion. We all hurt, we all die. There is no need for God to tell me.

Sad truth is that many people do not read science literature, many people do not think. Their highest effort is to visit place of worship. Necessity for religious moral source arise because of such people. They need God to tell them "honor your father and your mother, you shall not kill, commit no adultery, do not steal, do not false witness, do not covet neighbor's property" (Exodus 20:2-17). Interestingly, God also gave these commands: "I, the Lord, am your God; you shall not have the gods of others in My presence; you shall not carve idols for yourselves, bow down before them or worship them". God admits that "I, the Lord, your God, am a jealous God". There are two very interesting things I notice: 1) there are other Gods (gods of others) and 2) jealousy. How can there be other gods if this one is only and true? How can utmost being be emotionally affected? That is human trait. Supreme deity must be above any weakness. If God is jealous he can simply make other gods disappear.

In Deuteronomy 5:6-21, God's commands are repeated: "You shall not have the gods of others in My presence". Again, utmost being mentions other gods (as gods of others). This is illogical. Are we talking about utmost being or that every religion has its own deity? Obviously, the later is the case. Hence, God himself reveals that every religion has its own deity which is indirect statement opposing uniqueness.

Religion makes me dull. Thousands of interwoven decrees, often contradicting, theological labyrinth of confusingly elaborated axioms which only clerics are permitted to interpret denying individuals of healthy, literate, educated status any intellectual credibility other than to serve and obey pastoral hierarchy.

Belief system uses an enclosed reasoning in which every posed question is answered by certain quote from the Bible which is considered to be God's will because Pope says so and he is infallible since it is written in the catechism that he is unmistakable which must be true due to the fact that it is written in the Bible which is word of the God, and so on and so on. We drive around in circles coming to the exact same place after exhausting full tank of gasoline.

Why women can't be ordained? Are women less intelligent, less worth? Difference between genders is in one (1) pair of chromosomes out of twenty three (23) pairs or two chromosomes out of forty six (46) total. Meaning, males and females are more than 95% genetically alike.

When I look plants leaves I notice middle section branching laterally. It irresistibly reminds me of human and animal spine structure with peripheral nerves. Then I compare animals and humans finding that morphology is evidently identical having head, torso, limbs, senses, vital organs and molecular base in almost every existing specie with certain genetic adaptations like adjusted parts (wings, rougher skin, longer neck), more

developed or modified perception (infrared vision, infrasound communication), specific chemical production (pheromones, toxins). All these disclosures both instinctively and logically led me to conclusion that variations have been constructed from same fundamental matter (atoms) through deoxyribonucleic acid differentiations, combinations and recombinations presumably not linear between principal taxonomic grading but disintegrated to elements and reassembled in superior order. Give this process enough time and you will get homo sapiens. Only remaining question is what agency stands behind this operation: God or Nature? Maybe both names are essentially of one and the same root.

I checked medical classification to see is there anything related to God and religion. ICD-11 (International Classification of Diseases) has religious delusion disorder listed in chapter 06 Mental, behavioural or neurodevelopmental disorders, code MB26.08 which states as follows: "Religious delusion refers to a delusion involving religious or spiritual themes or subject matter that other members of the person's religious group do not accept as possible". Does this mean that society (majority) selects correct belief and if one decides to be anything else than imposed, either atheist or of different faith, (s)he is religiously delusional? Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5-TR), ICD equivalent valid in USA, specifies Religious or Spiritual Problem under V62.89 (Z65.8) code as follows: "distressing experiences involving loss or questioning of faith, problems associated with conversion to a new faith or questioning of spiritual values". Does this mean that those who lose or question faith are mentally sick? Both definitions are written in such manner I really get an alluding impression, although never heard about particular example of either. I think it concerns situations where symptomatic complications coincide.

There is a paradox I call "brain restrain". God created human brain (mind, powerful thinking processor) but at the same time its use is strictly

prohibited in intellectual sense and allowed only for repetitive, ceremonial service (praying) while scientific inquiry is considered to be heresy unless it restrains from dealing with crucial issues like discerning the roots, finding origins of the Universe.

There are people who attain degree in philosophy, receive title philosopher, but at the same time consider themselves believers which is obvious contradiction because prior means love for wisdom or seeking knowledge while second assuming predetermined claims to be real truths without any intellectual scrutiny.

Joke: gypsy person of muslim faith called himself Jesus and accepted Christianity through baptism but continued to visit mosque for prayer. That way, cunningly, in afterlife he will reap fruits of both sacred trees.

13/04/2024, updated 22/04/2024